



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/748,715	12/30/2003	Thomas Odorzynski	19197 (27839-2575)	2119

45736 7590 05/02/2011

Christopher M. Goff (27839)
ARMSTRONG TEASDALE LLP
7700 Forsyth Boulevard
Suite 1800
St. Louis, MO 63105

EXAMINER

DAGNEW, SABA

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3688

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-------------------	---------------

05/02/2011

ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

USpatents@armstrongteasdale.com

1 UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

2
3
4 BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS
5 AND INTERFERENCES
6

7
8 *Ex parte* THOMAS ODORZYNSKI
9

10
11 Appeal 2010-004574
12 Application 10/748,715
13 Technology Center 3600
14

15
16 Before ANTON W. FETTING, JOSEPH A. FISCHETTI, and
17 BIBHU R. MOHANTY, *Administrative Patent Judges*.
18 FETTING, *Administrative Patent Judge*.

19 DECISION ON APPEAL

STATEMENT OF THE CASE¹

Thomas Odorzynski (Appellant) seeks review under 35 U.S.C. § 134 (2002) of a final rejection of claims 1,3-8,10-18,20,22,24-29,and 31-33, the only claims pending in the application on appeal. We have jurisdiction over the appeal pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 6(b) (2002).

The Appellant invented a way of using diapers as an advertising medium (Specification 1:21-22).

An understanding of the invention can be derived from a reading of exemplary claim 1, which is reproduced below [bracketed matter and some paragraphing added].

1. A method of advertising, the method comprising:
 - [1] selling space on a disposable diaper to a sponsor; and
 - [2] placing an ad for a product other than disposable diapers onto the disposable diaper.

The Examiner relies upon the following prior art:

Gabler	US 5,481,758	Jan. 9, 1996
Iwamoto	WO 03/028496 A1	Apr. 10, 2003

Claims 1, 3, 6, 8, 12, 14-17, 20, 22, 25, 26, 28, 31, and 32 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by Gabler.

¹ Our decision will make reference to the Appellant's Appeal Brief ("App. Br.," filed September 11, 2009) and Reply Brief ("Reply Br.," filed January 13, 2010), and the Examiner's Answer ("Ans.," mailed December 9, 2009).

1 Claims 4, 5, 7, 10, 11, 13, 18, 24, 27, 29, and 33 stand rejected under 35
2 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Gabler and Iwamoto².

3
4 ISSUES

5 The issue of anticipation turns on whether a diaper is an undergarment.

6 FACTS PERTINENT TO THE ISSUES

7 The following enumerated Findings of Fact (FF) are believed to be
8 supported by a preponderance of the evidence.

9 *Facts Related to the Prior Art*

10 *Gabler*

11 01. Gabler is directed to a garment having a message on the outer
12 surface. Gabler 1:9-10.

13 02. Gabler describes how its messages are not limited to outer
14 garments but can also be applied to clothing normally seen only in
15 private including underwear. Gabler 2:57-60.

16 03. Gabler's Fig. 3 displays a commercial message, implying the
17 space for the message was sold as advertising.

18 *Iwamoto*

² Although the heading for this rejection excludes claim 33, the analysis for the rejection of claim 33 is included under this heading in both the Final Rejection and Answer. We take the omission from the heading as a typographic error.

04. Iwamoto is directed to a novel advertising medium using a detachable advertisement display for clothing. Iwamoto Abstract.

ANALYSIS

Claims 1, 3, 6, 8, 12, 14-17, 20, 22, 25, 26, 28, 31, and 32 rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by Gabler.

We are unpersuaded by the Appellant's argument that Gabler fails to describe a disposable diaper. Appeal Br. 4-6. Gabler describes applying messages to undergarments such as underwear. This is clearly a genus for which disposable diapers would be a species. Whether disposable diapers are constructed differently than other forms of underwear as the Appellant contends is not pertinent to the issue of whether a diaper is a garment worn under other clothing. Similarly, whether the means for attaching a message would be structurally different for diapers as the Appellant contends is not pertinent as no means is claimed and the claims do not recite attachment, but merely placement onto the diaper.

We are also unpersuaded by the Appellant's argument that MPEP § 2131.02 states that a description of a genus does not necessarily anticipate a species. Reply Br. 2. There are a limited number of types of undergarments, compared to the many variations of chemical formulas cited in MPEP § 2131.02. Accordingly, one would have immediately envisaged diapers as among those garments worn under clothing by extremely young children.

1 *Claims 4, 5, 7, 10, 11, 13, 18, 24, 27, 29, and 33 rejected under 35 U.S.C.*
2 *§ 103(a) as unpatentable over Gabler and Iwamoto.*

3 We are unpersuaded by the Appellant's arguments that art fails to
4 describe the claimed structure of a disposable diaper. As the Examiner
5 found, the structure does not affect one's ability to simply place a message
6 somewhere upon a diaper, and the structure recited of an absorbent pad,
7 bodyside liner, and liquid impermeable backsheet, is known by ordinary
8 consumers, much less those of ordinary skill, to be that of many
9 conventional disposable diapers.

10

11 CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

12 The rejection of claims 1, 3, 6, 8, 12, 14-17, 20, 22, 25, 26, 28, 31, and
13 32 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by Gabler is proper.

14 The rejection of claims 4, 5, 7, 10, 11, 13, 18, 24, 27, 29, and 33 under
15 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Gabler and Iwamoto is proper.

16

17 DECISION

18 To summarize, our decision is as follows.

- 19 • The rejection of claims 1, 3, 6, 8, 12, 14-17, 20, 22, 25, 26, 28, 31, and
20 32 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by Gabler is sustained.
- 21 • The rejection of claims 4, 5, 7, 10, 11, 13, 18, 24, 27, 29, and 33 under
22 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Gabler and Iwamoto is
23 sustained.

No time period for taking any subsequent action in connection with this appeal may be extended under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a). *See* 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a)(1)(iv) (2007).

AFFIRMED

mev